

1 JONATHAN W. BIRDT (SBN 183908)  
2 jbirdt@brachfeldcollections.com  
3 THE BRACHFELD LAW GROUP, P.C.  
4 880 Apollo St., Suite 155  
5 El Segunda, CA 90245  
6 Telephone: (310) 273-7867  
7 Facsimile:(310) 273-9867

8  
9  
10 Attorneys for Defendant  
11 The Brachfeld Law Group P.C.

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
**SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

DONNA GARCIA    } Case No.: 11cv-01253 EMC  
Plaintiff,    } Hon. Edward M. Chen  
vs.    }  
RESURGENT CAPITAL SERVICES L.P.,                 } DECLARATION OF JONATHON W.  
LVNV FUNDING, LLC, THE                                } BIRDT IN SUPPORT OF  
BRACHFELD LAW GROUP, P.C. a.k.a.                 } DEFENDANTS' JOINT OPPOSITION  
BRACHFELD & ASSOCIATES, P.C. and                } TO PLAINTIFF DONNA GARCIA'S  
DOES 1-10,    } MOTION FOR ATTORNEY FEES AND  
Defendants.    } COSTS  
Date:    July 31, 2012  
Time:    1:30 p.m.  
Location:     Courtroom No. 5  
   Federal Building  
    17th Floor  
   450 Golden Gate Ave.  
   San Francisco, CA 94102  
Complaint Filed:                                         March 15, 2011

I, Jonathon W. Birdt, declare:

1. I am an attorney licensed to practice before the courts of the State of California and I am admitted to practice before this court. I am employed by Brachfeld

1 Law Group and I am its attorney of record in this action. I have personal knowledge of  
 2 the facts recited in this declaration and could competently testify thereto if called upon to  
 3 do so.

4       2. From the start of this case, Plaintiff never made any effort to resolve, never  
 5 made a concrete demand, and when offers were made, they were ignored. In fact,  
 6 following the settlement conference with Judge Zimmerman, defendants struggled to  
 7 raise the money for the settlement proposed by Judge Zimmerman, and when then did, 3  
 8 weeks later, Plaintiff claimed to have incurred \$30,000 in additional fees and rejected the  
 9 six figure settlement offer. It was obvious that counsel was litigating this matter to  
 10 maximize fees, and not seek reasonable resolution.

11       3. Thereafter, every settlement discussion was very frustrating, every time  
 12 defendants offered more money, Plaintiffs counsel would raise their demand. Had  
 13 Plaintiffs counsel acted reasonably and made a good faith effort to resolve this very  
 14 simple and straightforward case, it would have resolved long ago, for much less,  
 15 rendering the majority of the fees claimed unreasonable for that reason alone. All  
 16 counsel have an affirmative duty to ease the burden on the Court and make every effort to  
 17 reach a reasonable resolution of case. The instant motion seeks more than 5 times  
 18 Plaintiffs actual recovery in this matter.

19       4. From the outset, Defendant admitted to receipt of the cease and desist  
 20 letters, and to the number of calls made, yet, Plaintiff went on to take additional irrelevant  
 21 depositions to redundantly confirm these facts, presumably for the sole purpose of  
 22 creating a fee award.

23       5. The FDCPA claims were limited by motion to one year preceding the filing  
 24 of the complaint, though reading the plaintiff's moving papers, one would not be able to  
 25 determine that. Time sought and expended dredging up the past for purposes of the fee  
 26 claim, when such claim was limited as a matter of law to the FDCPA claims with two  
 27

1 attorneys is not reasonable. This case was settled, primarily because the scope of the  
 2 look back was enhanced by those other claims. Had Plaintiff only had an FDCPA claim  
 3 for which she is entitled to fees, the settlement and fees sought would be 10% of that  
 4 claimed.

5       6. Defendants did not dispute the calls made after a cease and desist letter, the  
 6 problem with this case was twofold: Plaintiffs insistence that her history of complaints  
 7 going back to 2006 were relevant to her FDCPA claim and Plaintiff counsels' complete  
 8 refusal to discuss settlement. Defendants even sought to accept the mediators proposal  
 9 following a settlement conference with Judge Zimmerman, but when they did, Mr.  
 10 Wilcox raised the bar, as he did each time thereafter when Defendants attempted to  
 11 resolve this matter.

12       7. The value of Plaintiffs claims was not the 40-50 calls she never answered, it  
 13 was the risk that the state law claims would bring in prejudicial evidence going back to  
 14 2006 that would bleed into the FDCPA claim.

15       8. Plaintiff identified a former Brachfeld employee, Courtney Hileman, as a  
 16 man in her call log. Brachfeld identified 3 possible Courtney's employed during the  
 17 relevant time frame. Plaintiffs sought only to depose a female named Courtney.

18       9. Plaintiffs counsel has not disclosed how much in fee has already been  
 19 received from the contingency arrangement which should be factored in to any award.

20       10. Plaintiffs fees should be apportioned among the various claims, and at best,  
 21 20% of the work performed can be attributed to the limited FDCPA claim that covered  
 22 only 1 year and was not in dispute.

23       11. Counsel notes that they even attempted to resolve this fee dispute and there  
 24 were several calls to discuss resolution, the first between myself and Mr. Wilcox where  
 25 we discussed settlement in the \$50,000 to \$180,000 range. Mr. Wilcox called back and  
 26 said Mr. Nathan wanted a multiplier and wasn't willing to reduce his fees, but if I could  
 27

1 send him case law he might. I conducted extensive research sending Mr. Nathan a long  
2 list of cases addressing our concerns regarding his fee claims. He called me and the  
3 number was now \$220,000 and he wanted a new demand. I suggested we would be  
4 willing to settle and might approach the \$120,000 range, but as usual, Plaintiffs number  
5 had just gone up again, instead of down. Mr. Nathan was then going to research the  
6 matter and call me back. He did and this time his demand was \$320,000 and he wanted a  
7 new number fo him. I told him of my frustration and told him we wanted to settle this  
8 claim. I told him I had authority to pay more and settle the entire matter in five minutes  
9 if he would simply make some concessions and negotiate down from the \$320,000  
10 number. He said he would speak with Mr. Wilcox and see if they wanted to get back to  
11 me. To date they have not.

12 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America  
13 that the foregoing is true and correct.

14 Dated: June 21, 2012

BRACHFELD LAW GROUP P.C.

15  
16 */s/ Jon Birdt*  
17 Attorneys for Defendant Brachfeld Law Group  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28